

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 5, 2006 has been received and carefully noted. The above noted amendments to the claims are submitted in accordance with 37 CFR §1.114 as a submission accompanying Applicants' filing of a Request for Continuing Examination. In the amendments, claims 1, 9, 12, and 13 have been amended, and new claims 29-33 have been added to the application. However, Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced via the above noted amendments. Therefore, claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-33 are pending and submitted for consideration.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 9 has been amend to address the rejection, and therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Molnar* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0168978), claims 1, 9, 13, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Ranjan* (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0123097), and claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Moussavian* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0172077). The Office Action took the position that *Molnar*, *Ranjan*, and *Moussavian* individually teach each and every element recited in the rejected claims.

Additionally, claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-15, 17-18, and 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over combinations of *Molnar* (U.S. Publication No.

2002/0168978), *Turcotte* (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,179), *Dickinson* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0196098), *Moussavian* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0172077), *Moles* (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0203947), *Sivula* (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0053689), and *Allison* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0083078).

Applicants traverse the rejections and respectfully submit that each of claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-33 recite subject matter that is not taught, disclosed, or otherwise suggested by any of the cited prior art references, when taken alone or in combination. Specifically, Applicants submit that none of the cited prior art references teach, show, or even suggest defining restriction information associated with terminating parties to include a restriction level for sending the message to the at least one terminating party, wherein the terminating parties are classified into a plurality of restriction levels, and further, controlling sending of a message based on the restriction information, as recited in each of claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-33. Therefore, Applicants submit that the cited combination of references, when taken alone or in combination, fails to teach, show, or suggest each and every limitation recited in the rejected claims. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-28 is respectfully requested. Similarly, since new claims 29-33 include the same limitations, consideration and allowance of claims 29-33 is requested.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'N. Alexander Nolte', written over a horizontal line.

N. Alexander Nolte

Registration No. 45,689

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

NAN:kag